

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/752,647	Applicant(s) JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Sue A. Weaver	Art Unit 3781	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sue A. Weaver. (3) _____.

(2) Richard Lazarus. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claims 1 and 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' attorney proposed amending claim 1 by adding the limitation that the dome has a diameter of at least about 25% of the diameter of the outer ridge. It is noted however that there doesn't appear to be any antecedent in the specification for this limitation. It is suggested that this be added to the description since it is reflected in the drawings. This limitation would appear to distinguish over Silver. It was suggested that applicant claim the protrusion as remaining directed away from the top upon cooling to distinguish over the slat et al '677 reference which changes orientation. This will eliminate the need to perfect the 131 declaration and appear to distinguish the claims over the art of record. Such an amendment will be favorably considered...